International Journal of Marketing and Technology
Vol. 11 Issue 02, February 2021,
ISSN: 2249-1058 Impact Factor: 6.559
Journal Homepage: http://www.ijmra.us, Email: editorijmie@gmail.com
Double-Blind Peer Reviewed Refereed Open Access International Journal - Included in the International Serial Directories Indexed & Listed at: Ulrich's Periodicals Directory ©, U.S.A., Open J-Gate as well as in Cabell's Directories of Publishing Opportunities, U.S.A

Host Perceptions of Tourism Impactsacross Demographic Variables

Ms. Fozia Sajad*
Dr. Mushtaq Ahmad Bhat**

ABSTRACT

It is increasingly recognized that achieving the goal of favorable community support for the tourism industry requires an understanding of how residents formulate their attitudes/perceptions toward tourists and tourism industry. They may contribute to the well-being of the community through their participation in the planning, development and operation of tourist attractions and by extending their hospitality to tourists in exchange for the benefits (e.g. income) of tourism. Residents may also play an important role in discouraging tourism by opposing it or showing hostile attitudes toward tourism developers and tourists. Unless tourism development is more responsive to people's needs over the long term, it may not be worth the social, cultural and environmental impacts and changes to host communities. In view of this well-known belief, an attempt has been made in the present study to measure variation in residents' perception towards tourism impacts across demographic variablesin Kashmir Valley. The study is based on data gathered from three hundred and eighty four (384) respondents andthe results lead us to the conclusion thatthere exists insignificant variation ($p>0.05$) ontourism impacts on majority of demographic variables under reference, meaning that residents' perceive the tourism impacts alike and don't differentiate them on demographic basis. Finally, the study also brought to light that there exists significant variation ($p<0.05$)on environmental impacts on some of the demographic variables under reference. An overall broad-based education and awareness campaigns needs to be launched on a large scale which can prove to be an important step towards enhancing local residents increased understanding/perceptions of the tourism industry and ultimately of fueling greater support and more positive views of what tourism can do for their communities.

KEY WORDS: Tourism Impacts, Demographic variables, Economic Impacts, Socio-cultural Impacts, Environmental Impacts and Kashmir Valley.

*Ms. Fozia Sajad is Ex-Research scholar in Department of Commerce, University of Kashmir, Srinagar, 190006. Email: zia.sajad467@gmail.com

**Dr. Mushtaq Ahmad Bhat is Professor and Head, Department of Commerce, University of Kashmir, Srinagar, 190006. Email: mb@uok.edu.in

INTRODUCTION

It has been widely recognized that tourism development is a double-edged sword for host communities (Wang, et. al., 2006). Not only does it generate benefits, but it also generates costs (Jafari, 1994). Depending on the amount of benefits and costs that residents receive from tourism, they have different opinions about tourism's influence on their community. A number of tourism researchers (McGehee and Andereck, 2004; Wang, et. al., 2006; Gu and Wong, 2006) have found that residents' attitudes towards tourism impacts are heterogeneous, i.e. diverse and far from homogeneous. That could be interpreted as in certain destination tourism's costs are greater than its benefits while others feel that tourism's benefits are greater than its costs. In other words, when residents perceive the positive impacts of tourism, they are willing to support additional tourism development, but residents who perceive more costs than benefits will likely oppose tourism development (Long, 1983). Consequently, residents are key actors in planning for tourism development (Gunn, 1994) and without them; negative economic, social, cultural and environmental consequences for local communities would likely be greater (Sheldon and Abenoja, 2001). These negative influences of tourism on residents can reduce the attractiveness of a destination which can adversely affect the income potential and employment opportunities for the local tourism industry (Kwon and Vogt, 2010). Therefore, in order to develop sustainable tourism community, support and inclusion of locals in tourism planning is crucial (Andereck and Vogt, 2000) i.e. residents' attitudes toward tourism development and their perceptions of the impact of tourism in their local communities are essential determinants of successful tourism (Yu, et. al., 2011). This is largely due to the fact that residents are affected directly by the tourism industry (Murphy, 1985; Ap, 1992). Moreover, residents not only have a significant influence in shaping tourists' experiences and the decision-making process, but also have an important voice regarding development and marketing of existing and future tourism programs (Gjerald, 2005).

Further, since tourism relies heavily upon the goodwill of the local residents, their support is essential for its development, successful operation and sustainability in the long term (Ap, 1992; Garrod and Fyall, 2000; Sheldon and Abenoja, 2001). In fact, the sense of residents' community attachment not only influences residents' perceptions of the impacts of tourism (Sheldon and Var, 1984; Um and Crompton, 1987; McCool and Martin, 1994) but also the relationship between residents and tourists (Brida, et. al., 2014). In this context, it is important to remember that tourists are more favorably attracted by

destinations in which residents are more friendly, honest and hospitable (Fallon andKriwoken, 2003). Therefore, the local community must increasingly be involved and given an active role, participating in the planning and management of local tourism policy in order to obtain its agreement and support (Dwyer, et. al., 2004; Simpson, 2009, Brida, et. al., 2014). Consequently, the primary aim of any destination manager should be to gain a thorough knowledge of the destination's characteristics that residents want to preserve and protect because understanding the residents' attitudes/perceptions towards the impacts of tourism implies to know the emotive relations between residents and their place (Brehm, et. al., 2004).

Objectives of the Study

In view of the growing importance of hostperception of tourism impacts, an attempt has been made in the present study, to measure variation in residents' perception towards select tourism impacts, across different demographic variables in Kashmir Valley. Such an analysis will provide tourism planners and policy makers an enhanced understanding of the residents' attitudes/perceptions and their relative influence on support for the tourism industrywith a view to make the overall tourism development more effective and efficient.

Literature Review

Demographic Factors

Demographic factors play an important role in order to understand the variance in residents' perception towards tourism impacts. Numerous research studies have focused on various demographic factors and residents' attitudes towards tourists and tourism development (Pizam, and Milman, 1984; Ross, 1992; Ap and Crompton, 1993; Johnson, et. al., 1994; Lankford and Howard, 1994; Lankford, 1994; Haralambopoulos and Pizam, 1996; Jurowski, et. al., 1997; Brunt and Courtney, 1999; Upchurch and Teivane, 2000; Andereck, et. al., 2005; Demirkaya and Çetin, 2010). Many researchers such as Murphy (1981); Brougham and Butler (1981); Murphy (1983); Tyrell and Spaulding (1984); Liu and Var (1986); Um and Crompton (1987); Allen, et. al., (1988); Davis, et. al., (1988); Milman and Pizam (1988); Husband (1989); Perdue, et. al., (1990); Schroeder (1992); Lankford and Howard (1994); Lankford, et. al., (1994); McCool and Martin (1994); Jurowski, et. al., (1997); Fredline and Faulkner (2000) and Harrill and Potts (2003) have studied variation in the perception of residents' attitudes across different demographic variables. Although research has suggested that demographic variables are significant

factors in forming the perception of residents towards different tourism impacts yet, there has been little direct analysis of those differences (Perdue, et. al., 1990 and Schroeder, 1992). Liu and Var (1986) in their study found that the length of residency was one of the most important socio-demographic variables explaining attitudinal differences in the perception of residents' towards tourism impacts. Similarly, Sheldon and Var (1984) in their study also found that the lifelong residents are more sensitive to the social/cultural impacts of tourism than are short-term residents. Other researchers (Pizam, 1978; Um and Crompton, 1987) suggested that longer the residents live in an area, the less positively residents perceive the impacts of tourism development in their community. Husband (1989) in his study concluded that age and education were good predictors of residents' attitudes toward tourism. In other words, he asserted that the level of education attained and the respondents' age were the most important variables associated with the perception of tourism effects. This opinion was supported by Tyrell and Johnston (2007) who observed that resident with higher levels of education has more positive attitudes towards tourism development. Further, Harvey, et. al., (1995) in their study on gender and community found that while tourism may provide employment for young people, men may perceive that tourism provides them livelihood. Similarly, Harrill and Potts (2003) too in their study reported that gender and economic dependency are significant predictors of perceived economic benefits of tourism.

Further, emphasizing the significance of demographic factors, many studies found out that the respondents (or their relatives, friends and neighbors) who depend upon a tourism-related job had a statistically significant positive relationship with the positive tourism factors (Murphy, 1981; 1983; Tyrell and Spaulding, 1984; Milman and Pizam, 1988; Lankford, 1994) meaning thereby that the residents who are economically related to tourism industry are more likely to recognize the benefits of the tourism development. In other words, these residents perceive the economic impacts of tourism positively. Tourism studies also suggested that the level of contact with tourists by residents might affect residents' attitudes towards tourism (Rothman, 1978; Brougham and Butler, 1981; Murphy, 1985; Lankford and Howard, 1994; Martin, 1995). Martin (1995) in his study concluded that the more contact people had with tourists, the more favorable their attitudes are towards the positive dimensions of tourism vice-versa (Yoon, 1998). In light of the above-mentioned research studies, it can safely be argued thatresident attitude/opinions towards tourism development are important as a tool for successful and sustainable tourism destinationsimprovement as well as overall development.

Sample Design

Keeping in the view the paucity of time and financial resourcesthe present study was confined to three zones of Kashmir Valley viz;North, Central and South. These three zones were further divided into various districts and out of these districts; two districts from each zone were selected for the present study namely, District Baramulla and Bandipura from North Kashmir, District Srinagar and Budgam from Central Kashmir and District Anantnag and Pulwama from South Kashmir. The selected districts have significant relationship with the sampled residents' in terms of important tourist spots, maximum tourist arrivals, business operations, tourist facilitation centers etc (official records of JKTDC). The questionnaires were distributed among the residents at different tourist attractions like: Mughal Gardens, Pahalgam, Gulmarg, Sonamarg, Daksum, Aribal etc. so as to ensure that the sample would be representative of the population and to search a range of views from the residents living in various parts of Kashmir Valley. Also, residents in these districts were likely to have more interaction with the tourists and may have more distinct perception than people from other districts. The size of the sample was limited to three hundred and eighty four (384) respondents selected from six (6) districts of Kashmir Valley.Proportionate stratified random sampling method was, however, followed for the present study. All-important demographic characteristics like age, gender, level of education, annual household income, length of residency, zone and tourist contact, was taken into consideration while seeking the response from the residents regarding their perception of perceived tourism impacts. All these aspects have an important bearing on the user's evaluation of perceived tourism impacts. The effort was made to give a balanced representation to above demographic characteristics to make the sample representative. The present study constitutes a sample where majority of the respondents fall in the age group of 26-50 years (40%) followed by the age group of 18-25 years (38%) and above 51 years (22%). In terms of gender, the sample comprises (35%) males and (65%) females.The data further shows that secondary level were heavy participants (56%) followed by graduates (28%) and post- graduates (16%). Respondents with annual household income of up to 2, 00, 000 lakhs were highest in number (44%) followed by the respondents having annual household income 2, 00, 001- 5, 00, 000 lakhs (35%) whereas respondents having annual household income of above 5, 00, 001 were least in number (21%). Further, respondents whose length of residency was above 21 years (46%) were in majority followed by respondents whose length of residency was 11-20 years (37%) and

up to 10 years (17%). Further, majority of the respondents in the sample belonged to high contact group (55%).

Research Instrumenton Tourism Impacts

On the basis of literature review, three main tourism impacts viz; economic impacts, socio-cultural impacts and environmental impacts were selected for the present study in order to measure the perceived impacts of tourism by the sampled residents. Economic impacts were measured in the form of employment opportunity, revenue from tourists for local business and government, standard of living, and cost of living, etc. Socio-cultural impacts were measured in the form of social problem, local service,preservation of the local culture, deterioration of the local culture, and cultural exchange between residents and tourists, etc. Further environmental impacts were measured in the form of pollution, solid waste, wild life and ecology. The scale items for tourism impacts were identified from the literature review. These items were borrowed from the studies conducted byMaethieson and Wall(1982);Sheldon and Var(1984); Liu and Var (1986); Lankford and Howard (1994); Ap and Crompton (1998); Weaver and Lawton (2001); Tosun (2002); Kim (2002) and Chen and Chiang (2005). In other words, the development of the measurement scale for this study followed the procedures recommended by Churchill (1979) and DeVellis (1991) for developing a standardized survey instrument. This led to the development of 40 initial scale items that related to the both positive and negative statements on the core construct i.e. the tourism impacts.However, the measurement scale was refined and modified to assess the construct proposed in the study. Therefore, reliability of the measurement scale was assessed.

The questionnaire was divided into two parts. The first part was designed to measure the perceived tourism impacts and the second part of the questionnaire contained questions relating to socio-demographic data about the respondents. The researchers introduced the tool of measurement in such a way that it briefly illustrated the topic of the study and procedures of response. The measurement grades were placed according to the 5-point Likert scale. The scale was ordered regressively as Strongly Disagree (1) to Strongly Agree (5). The study was conducted for six months during the year of 2017. A proportionate stratified random sampling method was employed in which five hundred(500) questionnaires were distributed to the residents who agreed to participate in the survey. The residents completed the questionnaires in the presence of the researchers.

The Statistical Package for the Social Science (SPSS-20 and AMOS-20) was used to analyze the data. To explore the dimensionality of the forty (40) item scale, the study

used R-Mode Principle Component-Analysis (PCA) with a Varimax Rotation and Eigen Value equal to or more than 1, which extracted three factors with explained variance of 50.625 percent in the data. The results are presented in the Table 1.1. Most of the factor loading were greater than 0.50, implying a reasonably high correlation between extracted factors and the individual items. The communalities of a twenty-eight (28) items ranged from 0.499 to 0.714 indicating that a large amount of variance has been extracted by the factor solution. The three factors were labeled as **F1- 'Economic Impacts' F2-'Socio-cultural Impacts' and F3 -'Environmental Impacts'**. The first factor economic impacts followed by socio-cultural and environmental impacts contained most of the elements (14, 9 and 5 respectively) and explained most of the variance (20.164 percent, 16.699 percent and 13.762 percent respectively) are the three important determinants of perceived tourism impacts.

Table: 1.1- Summary of Results from Scale Purification: Dimensions, Factor Loadings, Communalities, Eigen Value and Explained Variance

Factor/ Dimension	Item no.	Elements	Factor loading	Communalities	Eigen Value	Explained variance
F1 Economic Impacts	V1	Tax revenues from tourism used to improve roads,highways, and public services for residents.	.673	.593	7.347	20.164
	V2	Benefits of tourism to the community outweighing its costs	.643	.648		
	V3	Bringing more investment to the community's economy	.547	.616		
	V4	Creating more employment opportunities for local residents	.655	.499		
	V5	Generating tax revenues for local governments	.625	.595		
	V6	Helping national governments to generate foreign exchange earnings	.513	.522		
	V7	Increasing living standard of local residents	.609	.575		
	V8	Benefiting most local businesses	.631	.538		
	V9	Creating more jobs for non-locals than for locals	.587	.557		
	V10	Giving economic benefits to only a few people	.524	.537		
	V11	Increasingcost of living	.589	.544		

	V12	Increasing real estate prices	**.584**	**.565**		
	V13	Increasing the prices of many goods and services particularly essential commodities	**.583**	**.569**		
	V14	Leading to seasonal employment	**.506**	**.545**		
F2/ Socio-cultural Impacts	**V15**	Contributing to social problems such as crime, drug use, prostitution, and so forth in the community.	**.660**	**.604**	**2.076**	**16.699**
	V16	Encouraging residents to imitate other cultures which distorts traditional behavioral patterns	**.710**	**.589**		
	V17	Encouraging a variety of cultural activities for local residents.	**.501**	**.609**		
	V18	Improving the image of the host community	**.591**	**.598**		
	V19	Increasing social conflicts in the community	**.509**	**.589**		
	V20	Increasing the availability of recreational facilities (like swimming pools, tennis courts, ski slopes, etc.) for local people	**.651**	**.572**		
	V21	Leading to increased traffic congestion.	**.678**	**.555**		
	V22	Leading to the revitalization of traditional arts, crafts, and heritage/historical buildings	**.690**	**.610**		
	V23	Resulting in unpleasantly overcrowded shopping places for local residents	**.556**	**.554**		
F3/ Environmental impacts	**V24**	Hotels, airlines, attractions, and other related tourism businesses produces large quantities of waste products.	**.712**	**.637**	**1.443**	**13.762**
	V25	Causing environmental pollution like noise, littering and congestion	**.679**	**.700**		
	V26	Contributing to the preservation of the natural environment and the protection of the wildlife in the community	**.684**	**.714**		
	V27	Producing serious water pollution in lakes, bays, or the ocean.	**.740**	**.614**		
	V28	Tourists' littering destroying the beauty of the landscape	**.677**	**.593**		
TOTAL					**10.866**	**50.625**

In order to prove the internal reliability of the research instruments used i.e. tourism impacts scale, the researcher performed Cronbach's Alpha Test of Reliability on each

variable, which was extracted from principal component analysis by following Caramine and Zeller(1979) approach. This approach calls for relationship of an item score across the item specified, item to total correlation and overall Cronbach's alpha score. This aspect was measured by the correlation matrix depicted in the below mentioned Tables (1.2-1.4) complemented by the application of Cronbach's alpha score depicted alongside of the correlation matrix table.

Table 1.2: Economic Impacts

Inter –item Correlation															
Item label	Eco1	Eco2	Eco3	Eco4	Eco5	Eco6	Eco7	Eco8	Eco9	Eco10	Eco11	Eco12	Eco13	Eco 14	**Cronbach's alpha**
Eco1	1														
Eco2	.378	1													
Eco3	.264	.452	1												
Eco4	.237	.390	.428	1											
Eco5	.226	.313	.411	.458	1										
Eco6	.100	.187	.222	.276	.406	1									
Eco7	.125	.247	.261	.278	.380	.371	1								.830
Eco 8	-.013	.181	.252	.180	.234	.378	.224	1							
Eco 9	.136	.230	.224	.236	.273	.158	.308	.176	1						
Eco 10	.137	.269	.252	.268	.268	.239	.220	.261	.324	1					
Eco 11	.140	.188	.261	.185	.272	.230	.288	.190	.264	.302	1				
Eco12	.127	.247	.196	.253	.318	.187	.255	.319	.210	.353	.317	1			
Eco 13	.139	.222	.245	.226	.238	.314	.242	.249	.197	.193	.312	.341	1		
Eco 14	.128	.182	.228	.252	.365	.298	.318	.246	.333	.217	.306	.339	.347	1	

Note: ECO1-ECO14= Economic Impacts

Table 1.3: Socio-Cultural Impacts

Item label	SC1	SC2	SC3	SC4	SC5	SC6	SC7	SC8	SC9	**Cronbach's alpha**
SC1	1									
SC2	.263	1								
SC3	.179	.237	1							
SC4	.194	.281	.299	1						
SC5	.246	.173	.251	.256	1					.724
SC6	.092	.047	.259	.131	.186	1				
SC7	.199	.108	.243	.226	.277	.269	1			
SC8	.077	.139	.290	.357	.169	.294	.423	1		
SC9	.290	.178	.208	.244	.201	.263	.317	.265	1	

Note: SC1-SC9= Socio-cultural Impacts

Table 1.4: Environmental Impacts

Item label	ENV1	ENV2	ENV3	ENV4	ENV5	**Cronbach's alpha**
ENV1	1					.735
ENV2	.467	1				
ENV3	.297	.320	1			
ENV4	.316	.407	.341	1		
ENV5	.320	.394	.255	.452	1	

Note: ENV1-ENV9= Environmental Impacts

The construct validity was tested by applying Bartlett's Test of Sphericity and The Kaiser–Mayer–Olkin Measure of sampling adequacy to analyze the strength of association among variables. The Kaiser–Mayer–Olkin measure of sampling adequacy (KMO) was first computed to determine the suitability of using factor analysis. The result of the Bartlett's Test of Sphercity is 0.000, which meets the criteria of value lower than 0.05 in order for the factor analysis to be considered appropriate. Furthermore KMO measure for sample adequacy for tourism impacts scores is 0.858 which exceeds satisfactory value of 0.6 (Tabachnik and Fidell, 1989) and revealed a Chi-Square at 3403.515, ($P \leq 0.000$) which verified that correlation matrix was not an identity matrix, thus validating the suitability of factor analysis (Table 1.5).

Table: 1.5- KMO and Bartlett's test

KMO and Bartlett's Test	
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy	**0.858**
Bartlett's Test of Sphercity (Approx. Chi- Square)	**3403.515**
p-value	**0.000***

***Significant at 1% level**.

Analysis of Demographic Factors

The descriptive analysis of variance in residents' perceptions across different demographic factors such as age, gender, level of education, annual household income, your zone, length of residency and tourist contact with regards to economic, socio-cultural and environmental impactsare presented in the below mentioned Tables.

Tourism Impacts Variance across Age

With a view to measure tourism impacts variation in the perception of residents', if any, among different age groups, respondents were categorized in three age groups viz., 18-25 years (group 1st) 26-50 years (group 2nd) and above 51 years (group 3rd). Mean scores were calculated for each age group and for each impact separately followed by f-test, post-hoc test and the effect size test which are presented in the Table 1.7. The data in the below mentioned Table (1.7) shows that there exits insignificant difference ($p>0.05$) in the perception of residents on economic impacts as reported by the different age groups. Further, analysis of the data reveals relatively higher mean scores (3.78) as reported by the respondents belonging to the age group of above 51 years followed by the age group of 26-50 years (3.64) while as, relatively lower mean scores (3.58) were reported by the respondents belonging to the age group of 18-25 years. On socio-cultural impacts of tourism there exists insignificant variance ($p>0.05$) in the perception of residents as reported by the respondents belonging to different age groups. Comparatively higher mean scores (3.74) were reported by the respondents belonging to the age group of above 51 years followed by the respondents belonging to the age group of 18-25 years (3.65) and 26–50 years (3.62). In other words, the result of the study suggests that the respondents of higher age groups perceive that the socio-cultural impacts of tourism have a positive influence upon their quality of life.

Significant variance ($p<0.05$) have been reported in the perception of residents belonging to all age groups under study, regarding environmental impacts of tourism. Relatively higher mean scores (3.84) were reported by the respondents belonging to the age group of above 51 years followed by the respondents belonging to the age group of up to 26-50 years (3.67) and 18- 25 years (3.51) on the said impacts which explains that the respondents belonging to higher age groups perceive that environmental impacts of tourism has negative impact upon their quality of life as is evident by higher mean scores. Further, effect size to the extent of .026 signifies small differences in the perception of residents towards environmental impacts of tourism as per their age groups (refer Table 1.6 for Threshold Limits). The finding of the study is in line with the research findings of Husbands (1989) and Faulkner and Tideswell (1997) who reported significant differences in the perception of residents towards environmental impacts of tourism as per their age groups.

Table 1.6: Threshold Limits for the Effect Size

Range	Cohen's D (t-test)	Eta^2 (f-test)
Small	0.20	.01
Medium	0.50	.06
Large	0.80	0.14
Very Large	Above 0.80	Above 0.14

Source Cohen (1988) and Pallant (2001)

Table 1.7: Tourism Impacts Variance across Age

Tourism Impacts	Age (in Years)	Mean Scores	f-Value	p-Value	Effect Size Eta^2
Economic Impacts	18-25 Years	3.58	2.93	.054**	-------
	26-50 Years	3.64			
	Above 51 Years	3.78			
Socio-cultural Impacts	Up to 25 Years	3.65	1.08	.338**	-------
	26-50 Years	3.62			
	Above 51	3.74			
Environmental Impacts	Up to 25 Years	3.51	5.08	.007*	.026
	26-50 Years	3.67			
	Above 51 Years	3.84			

Note: *Significant (p<0.05) at 5% level; **insignificant (p>0.05) at 5% level

Table 1.7.1: Shows homogeneity based on Age Groups Turkey B (Environmental Impacts)

Age	Subset for alpha = 0.05	
	1	2
18-25 Years	3.5137	
26-50 Years	3.6629	3.6629
Above 51 Years		3.8448

To gain more insight of differences among the different age groups on environmental impacts, Turkey B Post hoc test was conducted. The results (Table 1.7.1) clearly identified two homogenous subsets for all the categories of age groups and the data in the subsets clearly shows significant variances among the different age groups offered by two subsets. Moreover, respondents belonging to 2nd age group (26-50) years fall between two heterogeneous subsets.

Tourism Impacts Variance across Gender

The impact of gender differences, if any, in the perception of residents towards tourism impacts under study, was also studied. The gender-wise mean scores on each tourism impacts are presented in the Table 1.8 followed by t-test and effect size test to determine the level of significant differences. The analysis of the data on the said Table (1.8) brings to light insignificant variance ($p>0.05$) in the perception of residents on economic impacts as reported by the gender group meaning thereby that residents based on gender have similar observations of tourism impacts. However, male respondents reported relatively higher mean scores (3.73) on economic impacts of tourism as compared to female respondents (3.57). On socio-cultural impacts of tourism, respondents have reported insignificant ($p>0.05$) differences. Relatively male respondents have reported high mean scores (3.72) followed by female respondents (3.61) on the said dimension. On environmental impacts of tourism, insignificant ($p>0.05$) difference was observed as reported by the gender groups. Relatively higher mean scores (3.63) were reported by the male respondents as compared to their female respondents (3.61). The research finding is consistent with the research findings of Mason and Cheyne (2000) and Harrill and Potts (2003) who in their studies have reported insignificant difference of tourism impacts based on gender.

Table 1.8:Tourism Impacts Variance across Gender

Tourism Impacts	Gender	Mean Scores	t-Value	p-Value	Effect Size Cohen's D
Economic Impacts	Male	3.73	2.72	.966**	-------
	Female	3.57			
Socio-cultural Impacts	Male	3.72	1.98	.055**	-------
	Female	3.61			
Environmental Impacts	Male	3.63	.228	.948**	-------
	Female	3.61			

Note: *Significant (p<0.05) at 5% level; **insignificant (p>0.05) at 5% level

Tourism Impacts Variance across Level of Education

With a view to study variances in the perception of residents if any, at different levels of education, respondents were divided into three levels viz., level 1st (up to higher secondary) level 2nd (Graduation) and level 3rd (Post-Graduation). Mean scores for different levels of education were calculated for each group and for each tourism impacts separately which are presented in Table 1.9. The analysis of the Table (1.9) clearly reveals

that there exists significant difference (P<0.05) in the perception of residents on economic impacts, as per their level of education. In other words, it brings to light that while evaluating the economic impacts, residents' perception or attitude do vary/differ according to their level of education with the medium effect size of .060 (refer Table 1.6 for threshold limits). The analysis moreover, brings to light that the respondents who are Post-graduates reported relatively higher mean scores (4.03) followed by graduates (3.61) while as, relatively lower mean scores (3.57) have reported by the respondents belonging to higher secondary level education group. Further, the data on socio-cultural impacts of tourism evidences that there exists significant variance (p<0.05) in the perception of residents while evaluating the said dimension with the small effect size of (.023). However, respondents who were post graduates have reported relatively higher mean scores (3.89) followed by respondents who were graduates (3.65) while as, relatively lower mean scores (3.61) were reported by the respondents belonging to up to higher secondary level education group. On environmental impacts of tourism, there exits significant variance (p<0.05) in the perception of residents with the small effect size of .036. Relatively higher mean scores (4.03) were reported by the post-graduate respondents followed by the higher secondary level education group (3.58) while as, lower mean scores (3.55) were reported by the graduate level respondents on the said dimension. This research finding of the study is in line with the research findings of Husbands (1989); Faulkner and Tideswell (1997); Teye, et. al., (2002); Andriotis and Vaughan (2003).

1.9: Tourism Impacts Variance across Level of Education

Tourism Impacts	Level of Education	Mean Scores	f-Value	p-Value	Effect Size Eta2
Economic Impacts	Up to higher secondary level	3.57	12.06	.000*	.060
	Graduation	3.61			
	Post-Graduation	4.03			
Socio-cultural Impacts	Up to higher secondary level	3.61	4.54	.000*	.023
	Graduation	3.65			
	Post-Graduation	3.89			
Environmental Impacts	Up to higher secondary level	3.58	7.06	.001*	.036
	Graduation	3.55			
	Post-Graduation	4.03			
	Graduation	3.60			

Significant (p<0.05) at 5% level; **insignificant (p>0.05) at 5% level

Table 1.9.1: Shows homogeneity based on Education Levels Turkey B (Economic Impacts)

LEVEL OF EDUCATION	Subset for alpha = 0.05	
	1	2
Up to Higher Secondary level	3.5753	
Graduation	3.6115	
Post - Graduation		4.0367

The above findings are complemented with the effect size (.060) (see Table 1.6) which signifies medium differences in the mean values across all educational groups. Nevertheless, results from the Turkey B Post hoc test, distinguishes respondents having educational qualification as graduates and post-graduates for the underlying causative differences.

Table 1.9.2: Shows homogeneity based on Education Levels Turkey B (socio-cultural impacts)

LEVEL OF EDUCATION	Subset for alpha = 0.05	
	1	2
Up to Higher Secondary level	3.6125	
Graduation	3.6573	
Post - Graduation		3.8979

The effect size (.023) calculated on the mean scores of socio-cultural impacts across all level of education indicates small differences (refer Table 1.6 for Threshold Limits for the Effect Size) in the perception of residents while evaluating the said dimension. However, to gain more insight of differences among the different levels of education on the bases of socio-cultural impacts, Turkey B Post hoc test was conducted and the results of the above mentioned Table (1.9.2) clearly identified two homogenous subsets for all the three levels of education and the data in the subsets clearly distinguishes respondents having educational qualification as graduates and post-graduates for the underlying causative differences.

Table 1.9.3: Shows homogeneity based on Education Levels Turkey B (Environmental Impacts)

LEVEL OF EDUCATION	Subset for alpha = 0.05	
	1	2
Up to Higher Secondary level	3.5533	
Graduation	3.5842	
Post - Graduation		4.0378

The above findings are complemented with the effect size of .036 (see Table 1.6) which signifies small differences in the mean values across all educational groups. Nevertheless, results from the Turkey B Post hoc test, distinguishes respondents having educational qualification as graduates and post-graduates for the underlying causative differences.

Tourism Impacts Variance across Annual Household Income

To analyze variances in the perception of residents towards tourism impacts under study based on their varying income levels, respondents were categorized into three income groups viz., (group 1st) up to 2, 00,000 lakhs, (group 2nd) 2, 00, 001- 5, 00,000 lakhs and (group 3rd) above 5, 00, 001 lakhs followed by the f-test, to determine the degree of significant difference, if any, among varied income groups. This was again followed by post-hoc test and effect size test to analyze precisely variance in the perception of residents' in different income groups, under study and the size of such variance. The data in the below mentioned (Table 1.10) clearly shows that on economic impacts insignificant variance ($p>0.05$) in the perception of residents has been observed for all the categories of income groups. However, respondents belonging to the 3rd income group have reported relatively higher mean scores (3.78) followed by the 1st income group (3.63). As far as the respondents belonging to the 2nd income group are concerned, they have reported relatively low mean scores (3.56). Further, analysis of the said Table (1.10) brings to light insignificant variance ($p>0.05$) in the perception of all the income groups on socio-cultural impacts. Relatively higher socio-cultural mean scores (3.73) have been reported by the respondents belonging to the 3rd income as compared to the respondents belonging to the 1st income group (3.66) while as, lower mean scores (3.66 and 3.61) have been observed by the respondents belonging to the 1st and 2nd income groups respectively.

On environmental impacts, respondents of all the income groups have reported significant variance ($p<0.05$) in their perceptions while evaluating the said dimension. Further, effect size of (.026) (refer Table 1.6 for Threshold Limits) shows small differences in the perception of residents as reported by different income groups. However, higher mean scores (3.95) were reported by the respondents belonging to the 3rd income group followed by the respondents belonging to the 1st income group (3.59) while as, relatively lower mean scores (3.55) were reported by the respondents belonging to the 2nd income group meaning thereby, that the respondents belonging to the higher income group (group

3rd) firmly believes that the environmental impacts of tourism negatively influences their quality of life as compared to the respondents belonging to the other income groups (group 1st and 2nd).The finding of the study was in consensus with the research findings of Murphy (1981; 1983); Tyrell and Spaulding (1984); Milman and Pizam (1988) and Lankford (1994).

1.10: Tourism Impacts Variance across Annual Household Income

Tourism Impacts	Annual Household income	Mean Scores	f-Value	p-Value	Effect Size Eta2
Economic Impacts	Up to 2, 00,000 Lakhs	3.63	2.40	.091**	-------
	2,00,001-5,00000 Lakhs	3.56			
	Above 5,00001 Lakhs	3.78			
Socio-cultural Impacts	Up to 2, 00, 000 Lakhs	3.66	.79	.452**	-------
	2,00,001-5,00000 Lakhs	3.61			
	Above 5,00001 Lakhs	3.73			
Environmental Impacts	Up to 2, 00, 000 Lakhs	3.59	.51	.006*	.026
	2,00,001-5,00000 Lakhs	3.55			
	Above 5,00001 Lakhs	3.95			

Significant (p<0.05) at 5% level; **insignificant (p>0.05) at 5% level

Table 1.10.1: Shows homogeneity based on Annual Household Income Turkey B (Environmental impacts)

ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME	Subset for alpha = 0.05	
	1	2
Up to 2, 00, 000 Lakhs	3.5597	
2, 00,001- 5, 00, 000 Lakhs	3.5938	
Above 5,00,001 Lakhs		3.9561

Moreover, the importance of variation in the perception of residents belonging to different income groups can be tested by conducting Turkey B Post hoc test and the results in the above mentioned Table (1.10) signifies that there exist small differences in their perceptions. In other words, the differences in the assessment of environmental impacts by

respondents belonging to different income groups were affirmed by small effect size (.026). Also, the results of the Table (1.10.1) clearly identified two homogenous subsets for all the categories of income groups and the data in the subsets clearly shows significant variances among the different income groups offered by two subsets.

Tourism Impacts Variance across Zone

To study the variances in the perception of residents' towards tourism impacts with regard to different zones, the respondents were categorized into three zones viz., North, Central and South Zone. Mean scores for each zone and for each tourism impacts were calculated separately which is presented in the Table 1.11 followed by f-test, post-hoc test and the effect size test. The analysis of the data in the said Table (1.11) clearly reveals that there exists significant variation ($p<0.05$) in the perception of residents as far as economic impacts dimension is concerned with a very large effect size (.236) (refer Table 1.6 for Threshold Limits). Relatively higher mean scores (3.93) were reported by the respondents belonging to the south zone followed by respondents belonging to the central zone (3.65) whereas respondents belonging to the north zone have scored lower mean scores (3.25) on the said dimension which suggests that the tourism leads to economic upgradation of south zone respondents followed by north and central zone respondents.

Data on socio-cultural impacts evidences that there exists significant variation ($p<0.05$) in the perception of residents with respondents belonging to south zone reporting relatively higher mean scores (3.78) followed by respondents belonging to central zone (3.64). However, respondents belonging to north zone are reporting low mean scores (3.50) on the same dimension. Further, effect size of .041 signifies small differences in the perception of residents belonging to different zones.

Respondents of all the zones shows significant variances ($p<0.05$) on environmental impacts with a very large effect size (.217). However, the respondents belonging to south zone have reported relatively higher mean scores (3.95) followed by central zone respondents (3.71) while as, relatively lower mean scores (3.10) were reported by the respondents belonging to the north zone. Thus, the finding supports the research studies of Brougham and Butler (1981); Um and Crompton (1987); Davis, et. al., (1988) and Lankford and Howard (1994) who suggested that while evaluating the tourism impacts, residents' zone have a significant influence on their perceptions.

1.11 Tourism Impacts Variance across Your Zone

Tourism Impacts	Your Zone	Mean Scores	f-Value	p-Value	Effect Size Eta2
Economic Impacts	North	3.25	58.71	.000*	.236
	Central	3.65			
	South	3.93			
Socio-cultural Impacts	North	3.50	8.18	.000*	.041
	Central	3.64			
	South	3.78			
Environmental Impacts	North	3.10	52.69	.000*	.217
	Central	3.71			
	South	3.95			

Significant (p<0.05) at 5% level; **insignificant (p>0.05) at 5% level

Table 1.11.1: Shows homogeneity based on your Zone Turkey B (Economic Impacts)

Your Zone	Subset for alpha = 0.05		
	1	2	3
North	3.2477		
Central		3.6512	
South			3.9355

The effect size (.236) calculated on the mean scores of economic impacts across all zones indicate a very large differences (refer Table 1.6 for Threshold Limits for the Effect Size) in the perception of residents while evaluating the economic impacts. However, to gain more insight of differences among the different zones on the bases of economic impacts Turkey B Post hoc test was conducted. The results of Table (1.11.1) clearly identified three homogenous subsets for all the zones and the data in the subsets clearly shows significant variances among the different zones offered by three subsets. Moreover, respondents belonging to 2nd zone i.e. central zone fall between three heterogeneous subsets.

Table 1.11.2: Shows homogeneity based on your Zone Turkey B (Socio-cultural Impacts)

Your Zone	Subset for alpha = 0.05	
	1	2
North	3.5057	
Central	3.6450	3.6450
South		3.7895

Moreover, the importance of variation in the perception of residents belonging to different zones can be tested by conducting Turkey B Post hoc test and the results in the

above mentioned Table (1.11) signifies that there exist small differences in their perceptions. In other words, the differences in the assessment of socio-cultural impacts by respondents belonging to different income groups were affirmed by small effect size (.041). Also, the results of the Table (1.11.2) clearly identified two homogenous subsets for all the zones and the data in the subsets clearly shows significant variances among the different zones offered by two subsets. However, respondents belonging to 2nd zone i.e. central zone fall between two heterogeneous subsets.

Table 1.11.3: Shows homogeneity based on your Zone Turkey B (Environmental Impacts)

Your Zone	Subset for alpha = 0.05		
	1	2	3
North	3.5057		
Central		3.7117	
South			3.9545

The effect size (.217) calculated on the mean scores of environmental impacts across all zones indicates a very large differences (refer Table 1.6 for Threshold Limits for the Effect Size) in the perception of residents while evaluating the environmental impacts. Turkey B Post hoc test results of the above mentioned Table (1.11.3) clearly identified three homogenous subsets for all the zones and the data in the subsets clearly shows significant variances among the different zones offered by three subsets. Moreover, respondents belonging to 2nd zone i.e. central zone fall between three heterogeneous subsets.

Tourism Impacts Variance across Length of Residency

To study the tourism impacts variances based on length of residency, respondents were categorized into three groups' viz., up to 10 years (1st group) 11-20 years (2nd group) and above 21 years (3rd group). Mean scores for each group and for each tourism impacts was calculated separately which is presented in Table 1.12 followed by f-test, post hoc and the effect size test. The data in the below Table (1.12) clearly reveals that there exists insignificant difference (P>0.05) in the perception of residents on economic impacts. However, higher mean scores (3.75) were reported by the residents whose length of residency was up to 10 years followed by residents whose length of residency was 11-20 years (3.64) while as, relatively lower mean scores (3.57) were reported by the residents whose length of residency was above 21 years which clearly reveals that longer the length of residency, relatively less are economic benefits of tourism perceived by the community.

Data on socio-cultural impacts brings to light that there exists insignificant difference (P>0.05) in the perception of residents while evaluating the said dimension. However, higher mean scores (3.70) were reported by the residents whose length of residency was 11-20 years followed by the residents whose length of residency was up to 10 years (3.68) while as, lower mean scores (3.59) were reported by the sampled residents whose length of residency was above 21 years. The data clearly shows that respondents belonging to the second group perceive positive socio-cultural impacts of tourism. However, on environmental impacts, data shows significant variance (p<0.05) in the perception of residents belonging to different residency groups with the small effect size (.018) (refer Table 1.6 for Threshold Limits). However, higher mean scores (3.74) were reported by the respondents whose length of residency was 11-20 years followed by the respondents whose length of residency was above 21 years (3.57) whereas, respondents whose length of residency was up to 10 years reported relatively lower mean scores (3.48) on the said impact. Results of the present study are in line with the research findings of Lankford, et. al., (1994) and Allen, et. al., (1998).

1.12: Tourism Impacts Variance across Length of Residency

Tourism Impacts	Length of Residency	Mean Scores	f-Value	p-Value	Effect Size Eta2
Economic Impacts	Up to 10 Years	3.75	2.74	.065**	-------
	11-20 Years	3.64			
	Above 21 Years	3.57			
Socio-cultural Impacts	Up to 10 Years	3.68	1.70	.183**	-------
	11-20 Years	3.70			
	Above 21 Years	3.59			
Environmental Impacts	Up to 10 Years	3.48	3.54	.030*	.018
	11-20 Years	3.74			
	Above 21 Years	3.57			

Significant (p<0.05) at 5% level; **insignificant (p>0.05) at 5% level

Table 1.12.1: Shows homogeneity based on your Zone Turkey B (Environmental Impacts)

Length of Residency	Subset for alpha = 0.05	
	1	2
Up to 10 years	3.4879	
11-20 Years	3.5708	3.5708
Above 21 Years		3.7429

The above finding of environmental impacts are complemented with the small effect size (.018) (see Table 1.6 for Threshold Limits) which signifies small differences in

the mean values across all groups. Nevertheless, results from the Turkey B Post hoc test, distinguishes respondents having residency periods of 11-20 years and above 21 years for the underlying causative differences.

Tourism Impacts Variance across Tourist Contact

With a view to study variances in the perception of residents towards tourism impacts, under study, as per their contact with tourists is concerned, respondents were categorized into two groups' viz., (group 1st) high contact; (group2nd) low contact. Mean scores for each group and for each dimension was calculated separately (Table 1.13) followed by t-test. The analysis of the Table (1.13) reveals that there exists insignificant difference (P>0.05) in the perception of residents while evaluating the economic impacts. In other words, it brings to light that the perceptions of respondents do not vary/differ as per their contact with tourists is concerned while evaluating the said dimension. However, respondents who had low contact with tourists have reported relatively higher mean scores (3.66) as compared to high contact tourists (3.58). Data on socio-cultural impacts brings to fore insignificant variances (p>0.05) in the perception of residents as reported by the tourist contact group. Relatively higher mean scores (3.67) were reported by the respondents who had low contact with tourists followed by the respondents who had high contact with the tourists (3.64). Further analysis of the said Table evidences that on environmental impacts respondents reported significant variances (p<0.05) for both the tourist contact group with the large effect size (.100) (refer Table 1.6 for Threshold Limits). However, higher mean scores (3.65) on the said impact were reported by the respondents who had low contact with tourists as compared to respondents who had high tourist contact with tourists (3.57). The finding of the study was in contradiction with the research findings of Rothman (1978) and Martin (1995) who hold the view that residents who had a high contact with tourists were associated with positive attitudes.

Table 1.13:Tourism Impacts Variance across Tourist Contact

Tourism Impacts	Tourist Contact	Mean Scores	t-Value	p-Value	Effect Size Cohen's D
Economic Impacts	High contact	3.58	-1.37	.115**	-------
	Low contact	3.66			
Socio-cultural Impacts	High contact	3.64	-.374	.444**	-------
	Low contact	3.67			
Environmental Impacts	High contact	3.57	-.980	.005*	.100
	Low contact	3.65			

Significant (p<0.05) at 5% level; **insignificant (p>0.05) at 5% level

Conclusion and Managerial Implications

In this study, a scale for measuring the residents' perception towards select tourism impacts was proposed through exploratory factor analyses resulting in three factors namely: 'Economic Impacts', 'Socio-cultural Impacts' and 'Environmental Impacts'. The first factor economic impacts followed by socio-cultural and environmental impacts contained most of the elements (14, 9 and 5 respectively) and explained most of the variance (20.164 percent, 16.699 percent and 13.762 percent respectively); this clearly indicates that the most important factor in predicting perceived tourism impacts is economic impacts followed by socio-cultural and environmental impacts. These research findings are in harmony with the research findings of Sheldon and Var (1984); Liu and Var (1986); Milman and Pizam (1988);Dogan (1989); Brayley, et. al., (1990); Inskeep, (1994); Gee, et. al., (1997) and Tosun (2002).

The analysis of perceived tourism impacts reveals that demographic variables played a significant role in forming the perception of residents while evaluating the different tourism impacts. The findings reported no significant difference in the perception of residents' according to their age groups, while evaluating the tourism impacts under study, except environmental impacts where significant difference existed ($p<0.05$). As per gender group, insignificant differences ($p>0.05$) were reported on all the impacts of tourism under study, while as, significant difference ($p<0.05$) was reported by the sampled respondents on all the impacts of tourism as per their level of education. As per annual household income insignificant variance ($p>0.05$) existed except environmental impacts where significant difference existed ($p<0.05$). Moreover, the perceptions of residents was found to be significant ($p<0.05$) as per their zones with all the impacts of tourism, under study,while as, insignificant differences ($p>0.05$) were reported on all the perceived tourism impacts except on environmental impacts where significant differences existed ($p<0.05$) in the perception of residents' based on their length of residency and tourist contact.

As the directly affected group and immediate participants, residents are more sensitive to tourism's impacts and benefits. They could make a relatively proper assessment of the current tourism development. In other words, long-term and successful development of tourism is dependent on the local community's attitude/perception towards tourism and tourists and is essential for visitor satisfaction and repeat visitation (Swarbrooke, 1993; Sheldon and Abenoja, 2001) i.e. tourism planners and community

developers should consider residents' standpoints when they develop travel and tourism programs and help residents realize their higher order needs related to social esteem, actualization, knowledge and aesthetics.At the same time, the modified questionnaire instrument used in the present study, if implemented in the right perspective, will surely go a long way in providing valuable input for tourism planners for dealing with the strategic managerial decisions, marketing and operation of existing and future programs and projects in order to make the overall tourism development in the Valley more effective and efficient.

References

Andereck, K. L., and Vogt, C. A., (2006), "The Relationship between Residents' Attitudes toward Tourism and Tourism Development Options", Journal of Travel Research, Vol. 39, No. 1, Pp. 27-36.

Ap, J., (1992), "Resident's Perceptions on Tourism Impacts", Journal of Tourism Research, Vol. 19, No. 4, Pp. 665-690.

Ap, J., and Crompton, J. L., (1993), "Residents' Strategies for Responding to Tourism Impacts", Journal of Travel Research, Vol. 31, No. 3, Pp. 47-50.

Andereck, K. L., Valentine, K. M., Knopf, R. C., and Vogt, C. A., (2005),"Residents' Perceptions of Community Tourism Impacts",Journal of Tourism Research, Vol. 32, Pp. 1056-1076.

Allen, L. R., Long, P. T., Perdue, R. R., and Kieselbach, S., (1988), "The Impact of Tourism Development on Residents' Perceptions of Community Life", Journal of Travel Research, Vol. 27, Pp. 16-21.

Andriotis, K., and Vaughan D.R., (2003),"Urban Residents' Attitudes towards Tourism Development: The Case of Crete", Journal of Travel Research,Vol. 42, No. 2, Pp. 172 - 185.

Brida, J. G., Disegna, M., and Osti L., (2014), "Residents' Perceptions of Tourism Impacts and Attitudes towards Tourism Policies", International Multidisciplinary Journal of Tourism, Vol. 9, No. 1, Pp. 37-71.

Brehm, J.M., Eisenhauer, B.W., and Krannich, R.S., (2004),"Dimensions of Community Attachment and their Relationship to Well-Being in the Amenity-Rich Rural West", Journal of RuralSociology, Vol. 69, No. 3, Pp. 405-429.

Brunt, P., and Courtney, P., (1999), "Host Perceptions of Socio-cultural Impacts", Journal of TourismResearch, Vol. 26, No.2, Pp. 493-515.

Brougham, J., and Butler, R. W., (1981), "A Segmentation Analysis of Resident Attitudes to the Social Impact of Tourism", Journal of Tourism Research, Vol. 8, No.4, Pp. 569-590.

Brayley, R., Var, T., and Sheldon, P., (1990),"Perceived Influence of Tourism on Social Issues", Journal of Tourism Research, Vol. 17, No. 2, Pp. 284-289.

Clifford, S., and King, A., (1993),"Local Distinctiveness: Place, Particularity and Identity", London, UK: Common Ground.

Chen, K. H., and Chiang, L., (2005),"Impact of Tourism on Residents in a Traditional District in Taiwan City, Taiwan", Journal of Asian Geographer, Vol.24, No.1-2, Pp. 93-111.

Churchill, G. A., (1979), "A Paradigm for Developing Better Measures of Marketing Constructs", Journal of Marketing Research, Vol. 16, No. 1, Pp. 538-562.

Carmines, E. G., and Zeller, R. A., (1979),"Reliability and Validity Assessment", Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Cohen, J., (1988),"Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences", (2nd ed.), Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Earlbaum Associates.

Dwyer, L., Forsyth, P., Spurr, R., (2004), "Evaluating Tourism's Economic Effects: New and Old Approaches", Journal of Tourism Management, Vol. 25, Pp. 307-317.

Demirkaya, H., and Çetin, T., (2010), "Residents Perceptions on the Social and Cultural Impact of Tourism in Alanya (Antalya-Turkey)", Journal of EKEV Akademi Dergisi, Vol. 14, No. 42, Pp. 383-392.

Davis, D., Allen, J., and Consenza, R. M., (1988),"Segmenting Local Residents by their Attitudes, Interested and Opinions toward Tourism", Journal of Travel Research, Vol. 27, No. 2, Pp. 2-8.

DeVellis, R. F., (1991),"Scale Development, Theory and Applications", Applied Social Research Method Series, Vol. 26. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Dogan, H., (1989), "Forms of Adjustment: Socio-cultural Impacts of Tourism", Journal of Tourism Research, Vol.16, Pp. 216-236.

Fallon, L. D., and Kriwoken, L. K., (2003), "Community Involvement in Tourism Infrastructure: The Case of the Strahan Visitor Centre Tasmania", Journal of TourismManagement, Vol. 24, No.3, Pp. 289-308.

Fredline, E., and Faulkner, B., (2000),"Host Community Reactions: A Cluster Analysis", Journal of Tourism Research, Vol.27, No. 3, Pp. 763-784.

Faulkner, B., and Tideswell, C., (1997), "A Framework for Monitoring Community Impacts of Tourism", Journal of Sustainable Tourism, Vol. 5, No.1, Pp. 3-28.

Gu, M., and Wong, P. P., (2006), "Residents' Perception of Tourism Impacts: A Case Study of Homestay Operators in Dachangshan Dao, North-East China", Journal of Tourism Geographies, Vol. 8, No. 3, Pp. 253-273.

Gunn, C. A., (1994), "Tourism Planning", 3rd Ed. New York: Taylor and Francis

Garrod, B., and Fyall, A., (2000), "Managing Heritage Tourism", Journal of Tourism Research, Vol. 27, No. 3, Pp. 682-708.

Gjerald, O., (2005), "Socio-cultural Impacts of Tourism: A Case Study from Norway", Journal of Tourism and Cultural Change, Vol. 3, No. 1, Pp. 36-58.

Gee, C. Y., Makens, J. C., and Choy, D. J., (1997), "The Travel Industry", (3rd ed.), New York: Van Nor Strand Reinhold.

Haralmbopolous, N., and Pizam, A., (1996), "Perceived Impacts of Tourism: The Case of Samos", Journal of Tourism Research, Vol. 23, No. 3, Pp. 503-526.

Husband, W., (1989), "Social Status and Perception of Tourism in Zambia", Journal of Tourism Research, Vol. 16, Pp. 237-255.

Harrill, R., and Potts, T., (2003), "Tourism Planning in Historic Districts", Journal of American Planning Association, Vol. 69, No. 3, Pp. 233-244.

Harvey, J., Hunt, J., and Harris, C. C., (1995) "Gender and Community Tourism Dependence Level", Journal of Tourism Research, Vol. 22, No. 2, Pp. 349-366.

Inskeep, E., (1994), "National and Regional Tourism Planning", New York, NY: Routledge.

Jurowski, C., (2001), "The Interplay of Elements Affecting Host Community Resident Attitudes toward Tourism: A Path Analytic Approach", Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, Virginia.

Johnson, J. D., Snepenger, D. J, and Akis, S., (1994), "Residents Perceptions of Tourism Development", Journal of Tourism Research, Vol. 21, No. 3, Pp. 629-642.

Jurowski, C., Uysal, M., and Williams, D. R., (1997), "A Theoretical Analysis of Host Community Resident Reactions to Tourism", Journal of Tourism Research, Vol. 36, No. 2, Pp. 3-11.

Kwon, J., and Vogt, C. A., (2010), "Identifying the Role of Cognitive, Affective and Behavioral Components in Understanding Residents' Attitudes Toward Place Marketing", Journal of Travel Research, Vol. 49, No. 4, Pp. 423-435.

Kim, K., (2002), "The Effects of Tourism Impacts upon Quality of Life of Residents in the Community", Doctoral Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.

Long, J. S., (1983), "Confirmatory Factor Analysis", Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publication.

Lankford, S. V., (1994),"Attitudes and Perceptions toward Tourism and Rural Regional Development", Journal of Travel Research, Vol. 32, No. 3, Pp. 35-43.

Lankford, S., and Howard, D., (1994), "Developing a Tourism Impact Attitude Scale", Journal of Tourism Research, Vol.21, Pp. 121-139.

Liu, J., and Var, T., (1986), "Resident Attitudes toward Tourism Impacts in Hawaii", Journal of Tourism Research, Vol. 13, Pp. 193-214.

Lankford, V., Chen, Y.,and Chen, W.,(1994), "Tourism's Impacts in the Penghu National Scenic Area, Taiwan", Journal of Tourism Management,Vol. 15, No. 3, Pp. 222-227.

McGehee, N. G., and Andereck, K. L., (2004), "Factors Predicting Rural Residents' Support of Tourism", Journal of Travel Research, Vol. 43, No. 2, Pp. 131-140.

Murphy, P. E., (1985), "Tourism: A Community Approach", London, Methuen.

Murphy, P. E., (1981), "Community Attitudes to Tourism: A Comparative Analysis", International Journal of Tourism Management, Vol. 8, Pp. 189-195.

Murphy, P. E., (1983),"Perceptions and Attitudes of Decision-Making Groups inTourism Centers, Journal of Travel Research, Vol. 21, Pp. 8-12.

Milman, A., and Pizam, A., (1988), "Social Impact of Tourism on Central Florida", Journal of Tourism Research, Vol. 15, No. 2, Pp. 191-204.

McCool, S., and Martin, S., (1994), "Community Attachment and Attitudes toward Tourism Development", Journal of Travel Research, Vol. 32, No. 3, Pp. 29-34.

Martin, S. R., (1995), "Montanans' Attitudes and Behavioral Intentions Toward Tourism: Implications for Sustainability", In McCool, S. F., and Watson, A. E., (Eds.), Linking Tourism, the Environment and Sustainability-Topical Volume of Compiled Papers from a Special Session of the Annual Meeting of the National Recreation and Park Association, Pp. 69-76, Ogden, UT: Intermountain Research Station.

Mathieson, A., and Wall, G., (1982), "Tourism: Economic, Physical and Social Impacts", New York: Longman Group Limited.

Mason, P., and Cheyne, J., (2000),"Residents' Attitudes to Proposed Tourism Development", Journal of Tourism Research,Vol. 27, No. 2, Pp. 391- 411.

Pizam, A., and Milman, A., (1984), "The Social Impacts of Tourism, UNEP Industry and Environment", Vol. 7, No. 1, Pp. 11-14.

Perdue, R. R., Long. P. T., and Allen, L., (1990),"Resident Support for Tourism Development", Journal of Tourism Research, Vol. 17, Pp. 586-599.

Pizam, A., (1978), "Tourism Impacts: The Social Costs to the Destination Community as Perceived by its Residents", Journal of Travel Research, Vol. 16, Pp. 8-12.

Pallant, J., (2001), "SPSS Survival Manual", Sydney: Allen and Unwin.

Ross, G. F., (1992), "Resident Perceptions of the Impact of Tourism on an Australian City", Journal of Travel research, Vol. 30, Pp. 13-17.

Rothman, R. A., (1978), "Residents and Transients: Community Reaction to Seasonal Visitors", Journal of Travel Research, Vol. 16, No. 3, Pp. 8-13.

Sheldon, P. J., and Abenoja, T., (2001), "Resident Attitudes in a Mature Destination: The Case of Waikiki", Journal of Tourism Management, Vol. 22, No. 5, Pp. 435-443.

Sheldon, P., and Var, T., (1984), "Resident Attitudes to Tourism in North Wales", Journal of Tourism Management, Vol. 5, No.1, Pp. 40-47.

Simpson, M. C., (2009), "An Integrated Approach to Assess the Impacts of Tourism on community Development and Sustainable Livelihoods", Journal of Community Development, Vol. 44, No. 2, Pp. 186-208.

Schroeder, T., (1992),"The Relationship of Residents' Image of their State as a Tourist Destination and their Support for Tourism", Journal of Travel Research, Vol. 34, No. 4, Pp. 71-73.

Swarbrooke, J., (1993), "Sustainable Tourism Management (2nd edition.), London: CAB International.

Tyrell, T., and Spaulding, I., (1984),"A Survey of Attitudes toward Tourism Growth in Rhode Island", Journal of Hospitality Education and Research, Pp.22-23.

Tyrell, T.J., and Johnston, R.J., (2007), "Tourism Sustainability, Resiliency and Dynamics: towards a More Comprehensive Perspective", Journal of Tourism and Hospitality Research, Vol. 8 No. 1, Pp. 14-24.

Tosun, C., (2002), "Host Perceptions of Impacts: A Comparative Tourism Study", Journal of Tourism Research, Vol. 29, No. 1, Pp. 231-253.

Tabachnick, B. G., and Fidel, F. S., (1989), "Using Multivariate Statistics", Sydney: Allen and Bacon.

Teye, V., Sirakaya, E., and Sonmez, S., (2002), "Resident Attitudes toward Tourism Development", Journal of Tourism Research, Vol. 29, No. 3, Pp. 668-688.

Um, S., and Crompton, J. L., (1987), "Measuring Resident's Attachment Levels in a Host Community", Journal of Travel Research, Vol. 26, No. 2, Pp. 27-29.

Upchurch, R.S., and Teivane, U., (2000), "Resident Perceptions of Tourism Development in Riga, Latvia", Journal of Tourism Management, Vol. 21, Pp. 499-507.

Yu, C. P., Chancellor H. C., and Cole, S. T., (2011), "Measuring Residents' Attitudes toward Sustainable Tourism: A Reexamination of the Sustainable Tourism", Journal of Travel Research, Vol. 50, No. 1, Pp. 57-63.

Wang, Y., Pfister, R. E., and Morais, D. B., (2006) "Residents' Attitudes toward Tourism Development: A Case Study of Washington", NC, Paper presented at the Proceedings of the Northeastern Recreation Research Symposium.

Weaver, D., and Lawton, L., (2001), "Resident Perceptions in the Urban-Rural Fringe", Journal of Tourism research, Vol. 28, No. 2, Pp. 349-458.